

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-114 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 7, 11, 18, 22, 26, 29, 31, 33, 42, 49, 55, 61, 75, 89, 96, 103, and 110 are independent claims. Claims 1-13, 17-21, 26-39, 41-46, 48-84, 86-88, and 103-114 stand rejected under the judicially-created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting. The applicants note with appreciation that Claims 22-25 and 89-102 have been allowed and that Claims 14-16, 40, 47, and 85 recite allowable subject matter.

The rejections are traversed.

**Regarding Double Patenting**

The Office Action cites Claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,007,318 and Claims 1-51 of U.S. Patent No. 6,375,874 as conflicting with the present claims. The present claims are not obvious over the patented claims. The rejections are therefore traversed.

For example, it would not have been obvious to deposit colored and colorless binder liquid at a particular location as recited in Claims 1-17. These claims do not read on any of the patented claims.

It would not have been obvious to provide an airflow through the feed reservoir or the build chamber as recited in Claims 18-21. These claims do not read on any of the patented claims.

It also would not have been obvious to print colored bands separated by a non-colored band as recited in Claims 26-32 or the tapering of bands as recited in Claims 29-32. These claims do not read on any of the patented claims.

It would not have been obvious to provide a moveable cleaning element, as recited in Claims 33-48. Note that Claim 42 has been amended to recite a moveable cleaning element to parallel Claim 33. These claims do not read on the patented claims.

Furthermore, it is believed that Claims 49-88 and 103-114 also are non-obvious over the patented claims. Each of these claims recite subject matter absent from the patented claims. These claims therefore do not read on the patent claims.

Reconsideration of the double patenting rejections is respectfully requested. If the rejections are maintained, the applicants request a more detailed analysis of how the present claims read on the patented claims.

Regarding New Claims

New Claims 115-143 have been added to the application. These claims are the allowable claims rewritten in independent form.

Acceptance and allowance are respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Statement


A Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) is being filed concurrently herewith. Entry of the IDS and favorable consideration of the references are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By   
Rodney D. Johnson  
Registration No. 36,558  
Telephone: (978) 341-0036  
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

April 7, 2007